(3)

C.F. Proof

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BILASPUR

WRIT PETITION NO. 2608 **/2005**

PETITIONER : Rakesh Gouraha, S/o. Shri Kailash Chand Gouraha, aged 43 years, Occupation – Service, presently posted as Junior Auditor in C.G. Rajya Krishi Vipnan Marketing Board, Raipur (C.G), R/o. Rajkishore Nagar MIG – 8, Bilaspur (C.G.)

P.R. No. 2690/05 Presented by Shri T.S. Sahu dated 17/6/05

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS

R 1. Union of India, Through Secretary, Department of personnel & Training, Ministry of Govt. of India, New Delhi.

2. Public Sector Undertaking Committee, Through its President State Re-organisation cell, General Administration, Department, State of M.P. Vallabh Bhawan, Bhopal (M.P.)

3. State of M.P. Through Secretary, Department of Agricultural, Vallabh Bhawan, Bhopal (M.P.)

R 4. State of Chhattisgarh, Through Secretary, Department of Agricultural, Vallabh Bhawan, Bhopal (M.P.)

R 5. C.G. State, Agricultural Marketing Board, Through its Managing Director, Purana Ganj Mandi Parisar, Raipur (C.G.)

R 6. M.P. State Agricultural Marketing Board, Through its Managing Director, Arera Hills, Jail Road, Kishan Bhawan, Bhopal (M.P.)

RECEIVED COPY 17.6. CLERK to A.G. (M.P.)

Received Copy Bilaspur 17/6/05 for U.O.I

Recd THAKUR VIJAY SINGH Solicitor General of India CHHATTISGARH HIGH COURT High Court Campus, Bilaspur (C.G.)

4455/05 18/6/05

(4)

WRIT UNDER ARTICLE 226/227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA FOR ISSUANCE OF A SUITABLE WRIT, ORDERS OR DIRECTION.

88

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

SINGLE BENCH : HON'BLE MR. SATISH K. AGNIHOTRI, J.

WRIT PETITION NO.2608 OF 2005

Petitioner : Rakesh Gouraha

versus

Respondents : Union of India and others

Present : Mr. Rajeev Shrivastava, counsel for the petitioner.
Ms. Sharmila Singhai, counsel for respondent No.1.
Mr. Sachin Singh Rajput, counsel for respondents No.2 and 3.
Mr. V.V.S.Moorthy, Deputy Advocate General with Mr. Arvind Dubey, Panel Lawyer for the State of Chhattisgarh/respondent No.4.
None for respondents No.5 and 6.

ORDER

(Passed on 1st Day of February, 2007)

Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the writ petition has become infructuous.

2. The writ petition is accordingly dismissed as having become infructuous. No order as to costs.

Sd/-
Satish K. Agnihotri
Judge

Gopal